

Amendment Dated November 6, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action of September 11, 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 2-17 are pending. Claims 2, 3 and 17 stand rejected. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 4-16 are allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Office Action sets forth at page 2, paragraph 1, "Claims 2, 3, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ES Patent No. 1,052,733 in view of ES Patent No. 1,051,839." Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome by the amendments to the claims for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 includes features not disclosed or subjected by the cited prior art, namely:

... bearing means disposed between the core and said surrounding wall, and coaxial with the orifice to guide rotation of the surrounding wall portion relative to the core portion and to support the forearm on the arm, wherein said bearing means comprises conical friction bearings. (Emphasis Added)

These features are described in Applicant's specification, for example, at page 6, line 27 through page 7, line 18.

The Office Action relies on ES Patent No. 1,052,733 as "[disclosing] an articulated arm and forearm 10, 11 including securing/articulation configurations 6-9, 16-20 and a flexible pulling element 14. ... ES Patent No. 1,051,839 discloses an articulated awning arm including securing/articulation configuration 1, 2a, 5-9 ... and an elastic element 3..." Although applicant respectfully disagrees with the overly broad interpretation of the cited art, applicants have amended claim 17 to further distinguish over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest that the bearing means comprises conical friction bearings.

In contrast, applicant's invention as recited by claim 17 requires that the bearing means comprise conical friction bearings. It is because applicants included the feature of conical friction bearings that applicant is able to provide an articulated awning arm having superior wear characteristics than the prior art of record. Neither ES 1,052,733 or ES 1,051, 839 have this advantage because neither include bearing means that comprise conical friction bearings.

Amendment Dated November 6, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action of September 11, 2007

Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that because the combination of cited prior art does not include each and every feature of applicant's claim 17 that the claim is not subject to rejection. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 17 and, thus, are likewise was not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17.

Applicant has added claim 18 which is dependent upon allowed claim 4. Basis for claim 18 may be found in applicant's specification as originally filed and more particularly in currently allowed claim 3. Applicant submits that claim 18 does not add new matter and respectfully requests that the claim be entered and allowed.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, applicant submits that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicant

JLE/cmd/kpc

Dated: November 6, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 6, 2007.



Kathleen P. Carney